

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action of November 03, 2005, has been carefully considered. Claim 1 has been amended to describe a reduced portion at the top of the outer shell and that the hexagonal portion extends from the reduced portion to the threaded portion as shown in the figures in general and specifically in FIG. 3. New Claims 4-8 have been added. The Claims 4-8 include a description of a glow plug having a glow plug body with a reduced portion on top, a hexagonal portion in the center, and a threaded portion at the bottom, a circumferential groove running continuously across all six faces of the hexagonal portion, and that the hexagonal portion extends from the reduced portion to the threaded portion. No new matter has been added.

### **Rejections Based on 35 USC § 103**

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-2 under 35 USC § 103(b) as anticipated by Brooks (US 4,582,981). Claim 1 has been amended to describe a glow plug body having a reduced portion on top, a hexagonal portion in the center, and a threaded portion at the bottom, with a circumferential groove running across all six faces of the hexagonal portion, and that the hexagonal portion extends from the reduced portion to the threaded portion. Brooks describes a glow plug for a diesel engine. Although there are some similarities between the glow plug of Brooks and the present invention, there are many differences which are required for the very different application of a diesel glow plug. Although Brooks includes a groove 95, the groove 95 is between a hexagonal portion 50 (below the groove 95) and a round portion (see FIG. 5 of Brooks) above the groove 95 which would prevent a socket from being placed over the hexagonal portion. The glow plug of Brooks is both structurally and functionally different from the present invention because a diesel engine glow plug is much larger than a glow plug for model car engines, and may be tightened using an open end wrench from the side. A model car glow plug is small and recessed, and may only be tightened using a socket over the top of the glow plug. Thus, even if scaled down to fit

a model car engine, a glow plug as described by Brooks could not be used in a model car engine, and because the glow plug of Brooks is intended for use in a diesel engine, there is no motivation to modify Brooks for model car engines. Further, diesel engine glow plugs do not use a removable igniter, and therefore the glow plug of Brooks does not use a removable igniter, and the groove 95 of Brooks is not provided to retain a removable igniter. Therefore, the structure of Brooks does not provide motivation to provide a groove to retain a removable igniter.

The Applicant therefore believes that the amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1 and advance Claim 1 to allowance.

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1. Because the Applicant believes that Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, the Applicant also believes that Claim 2 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 2 and advance Claim 2 to allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 3 under 35 USC § 103(b) as anticipated by Brooks in view of Bhat (US 4,088,105). Claim 3 depends from Claim 1. Because the Applicant believes that Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, the Applicant also believes that Claim 3 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 3 and advance Claim 3 to allowance.

## CONCLUSIONS

Claims 1-3 remain pending in the application. The Rejections of Claims 1-3 have been respectfully traversed. New Claims 4-8 have been added. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner advance Claims 1-8 to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth L. Green

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 44,724

Averill & Varn  
8244 Painter Avenue  
Whittier, CA 90602  
(562) 698-8039